



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/759,407	01/16/2004	Constantine Sandu	703170-5001	7484
7590	02/07/2005			EXAMINER VERBITSKY, GAIL KAPLAN
Bingham McCutchen LLP Suite 1800 Three Embarcadero Center San Francisco, CA 94111-4067			ART UNIT 2859	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

VA

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/759,407	SANDU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gail Verbitsky	2859	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2004.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 26-36 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 26-30 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) 31-36 is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Double Patenting***

1. Terminal Disclaimer has been received.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clayton et al. (U.S. 6644848) in view of Leith, Jr. (U.S. 2812921) [hereinafter Leith].

Clayton discloses a device/ pipeline comprising a temperature sensor (temperature sensing fiber) located within the pipeline between its wall and corrosion layer (col. 3, lines 1-7), thus, constituting a protective shield containing a temperature sensor. Clayton concerns with a deposit deposition on the inner wall of the pipeline (col. 2, lines 27-28) and thus, the protective layer.

Clayton does not explicitly teach to remove a deposit deposition (scraper) from the inside of the pipeline.

Leith teaches an electromagnetic scraper to clean (scrap deposit deposition) from the inside wall of the pipeline by forcefully moving the scraper along the wall from first position to second position.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the scraper, as taught by Leith, to the device disclosed by Clayton, so as to clean the

inside of the pipeline including its walls, in order to provide a better fluid transmission through the pipeline and prevent it from damaging fouling.

4. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clayton and Leith as applied to claims 26-29 above, and further in view of Tsui (U.S. 6206978).

Clayton and Leith disclose the device/ method as stated above in paragraph 3.

They do not explicitly state that the magnetic scraper comprises a permanent magnet.

Tsui discloses a device wherein a magnetic scraper comprises a permanent magnet.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the scrapper of the device, disclosed by Clayton and Leith, so as to have it comprise a permanent magnet, as taught Tsui, so as to provide a less expensive device and thus, minimize the manufacturing costs.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 31-36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 26-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art cited in the PTO-892 and not mentioned above disclose related devices and methods.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to the Examiner Verbitsky who can be reached at (571) 272-2253 Monday through Friday 8:00 to 4:00 ET.

GKV

*G. Verbitsky*  
Gail Verbitsky  
Primary Patent Examiner, TC 2800

February 04, 2005